The Puritan Dilemma: How Revolutionary Ideology Created Permanent Factional Warfare and Made Orthodoxy Impossible to Enforce

The Paradox of Appropriating Anti-Hierarchical Belief Systems to Maintain Elite Power

Thomas J. Bryan, Claude/Anthropic

Introduction: The Structural Trap

In October 1637, Governor John Winthrop convened a synod of Massachusetts Bay ministers to address what he perceived as a growing threat to colonial unity. The threat was not military or political. It was theological—or so it appeared. The real threat was something no one could openly acknowledge: that Puritan ideology, the very framework that had brought these elites to power, now prevented them from maintaining the interpretive authority they required to rule.

The crisis was called the Antinomian Controversy. It would consume the Massachusetts leadership for nearly two years. It would result in banishment of prominent citizens and excommunication of church members in good standing. It would force extended theological debate among educated ministers. Yet at its core, it was not about theology at all. It was about power—specifically, about who gets to interpret scripture authoritatively, who speaks for God, and who commands obedience based on that authority.

The Puritans had entered history as revolutionary anti-hierarchical force. They broke away from the English church by arguing that believers did not need priestly mediation to access God or understand scripture. "Sola scriptura"—scripture alone—was their revolutionary cry. Read the Bible yourself. Interpret it yourself. You don't need bishops. You don't need the entire apparatus of ecclesiastical hierarchy.

This was genuinely liberatory ideology. It empowered ordinary believers. It challenged established authority. It spread like fire across Protestant Europe.

But the Puritans in Massachusetts had a problem: they did not want to be liberated. They wanted to be the new elite. They wanted to rule. They needed authority. But the ideology they had appropriated to break English power now prevented them from establishing their own.

The Antinomian Controversy, the trials of Anne Hutchinson, and the endless factional battles that characterized Puritan Massachusetts can only be understood as attempts to solve this unsolvable problem. How do you establish authority when your ideology says that individuals should interpret scripture themselves? How do you maintain orthodoxy when the very system you created enables heresy? How do you punish those who take your revolutionary principles seriously?

The answer the Puritans attempted was to redefine the terms. They claimed to support individual scriptural interpretation—but only "proper" interpretation. They claimed scripture was sufficient—but only when interpreted correctly. And "correctly" meant "the way we, the ministers, interpret it."

This forced them into a permanent state of factional warfare. Whenever someone interpreted scripture differently, the leaders had to respond. They could not ignore it because ignoring it meant admitting that interpretation was open. They could not declare the person wrong based on authority because they had rejected the very concept of ecclesiastical authority. They had to fight out every dispute theologically, framing it as heresy, while the real dispute was about who held interpretive power.

This case study examines how the Puritan appropriation of anti-hierarchical ideology created a structural impossibility: the need to enforce orthodoxy using a belief system that prevented the enforcement of orthodoxy. The result was perpetual internal factional warfare, constant trials for heresy and sedition, and an always-fragile elite coalition that had to continually prove its authority through theological disputation rather than through institutional position.

Part One: The Revolutionary Achievement—Breaking the English Interpreter Class

How Puritanism Attacked Ecclesiastical Hierarchy

When Puritans emerged in England in the late 16th century, they faced an entrenched system of ecclesiastical power. The Church of England, under Elizabeth I and her successors, maintained a hierarchical structure descended from Catholicism. At the top were bishops appointed by the crown. Below them were priests who controlled access to the sacraments, interpreted scripture in sermons, and administered the rituals that supposedly determined salvation.

The theological foundation for this hierarchy was sophisticated. Only properly ordained clergy could validly administer sacraments. Only trained clergy could properly interpret scripture—ordinary believers were intellectually and spiritually unequipped to understand God's word without priestly mediation. The relationship between God and believer had to flow through the institutional church.

Puritans attacked this entire structure. They argued that:

1. **Scripture was self-interpreting**: The Bible was clear enough that educated believers could understand it without clerical explanation. Complicated passages could be understood by reading them in context and comparing them with other passages.

2. **Sacraments did not convey grace mechanically**: The Catholic and Anglican notion that properly performing a ritual automatically conveys grace was false. Sacraments were signs of grace already present in the believer, not vehicles through which grace was transmitted.

3. **Believers could interpret scripture directly**: God gave the Holy Spirit to all believers, not just ordained clergy. The Spirit illuminated scripture for any believer who read it with proper faith and study.

4. **Pastors were teachers, not mediators**: Ministers should be scholars who helped congregants understand scripture, but they did not possess unique interpretive authority. They were not gates through which God's word had to pass.

This was genuinely revolutionary. It said: You do not need ecclesiastical hierarchy. You do not need bishops. You do not need priestly mediation. You can read scripture yourself. You can encounter God yourself. The entire apparatus of institutional mediation is unnecessary.

In England, this ideology threatened bishops and the entire ecclesiastical establishment. Puritan ministers were sometimes suspended for refusing to wear vestments or follow Anglican ceremonies. Puritans were prosecuted in ecclesiastical courts. They faced pressure to conform or face loss of livelihood.

But Puritanism spread anyway. Why? Because it offered something people wanted: direct access to God, without intermediaries. It promised that truth could be known without deferring to institutional authorities. It empowered ordinary believers.

The Escape to America and the Unresolved Contradiction

When Puritans emigrated to Massachusetts Bay (particularly in the 1630 Great Migration), they thought they had escaped the problem. In England, they had to struggle against episcopal authority while simultaneously establishing their own authority as alternative interpreters. This was a losing position. They were constantly on the defensive.

In America, they could start fresh. They could establish a colony organized entirely on Puritan principles, without the English ecclesiastical hierarchy opposing them. They could create a society based on their ideology from the ground up.

But in making this escape, they did not resolve the fundamental contradiction. They still held the ideology that said "believers can interpret scripture themselves." They still claimed that they had rejected hierarchical authority. Yet they still needed authority. They still needed people to listen to them, to obey them, to accept their interpretation of religious and political matters.

The founding documents reveal this contradiction. John Winthrop's "Model of Christian Charity" (1630) presented Massachusetts as a covenant community where everyone was bound together through mutual obligation to maintain godliness. This sounded egalitarian and covenantal. It suggested that authority was based on shared commitment to covenant, not on hierarchical position.

But the actual governance structure was highly hierarchical. The General Court (initially the stockholder assembly of the Massachusetts Bay Company) held supreme authority. Church membership (controlled by existing members) was required for political franchise. Magistrates and ministers formed an interlocking elite that made decisions about doctrine, governance, and justice.

Yet this hierarchy could never be openly acknowledged. The ideology said that believers made decisions through covenant consensus. The ideology said that scripture was clear and that properly educated believers could understand it. The ideology rejected the notion that some people possessed unique interpretive authority.

So the elite had to maintain their authority while claiming not to have it. They had to enforce orthodoxy while claiming to support scriptural freedom. They had to exclude dissenting voices while claiming that all could read scripture.

This is the Puritan Dilemma in its essence: **How do you maintain elite interpretive authority when the ideology that made you elite explicitly rejects the concept of elite interpretive authority?**

Part Two: The Crisis Emerges—Anne Hutchinson and the Uncontrollable Believer

When Ideology Enables Its Own Challenge

Anne Hutchinson arrived in Massachusetts Bay in 1634, just four years after the colony's founding. She was 43 years old, highly educated for a woman of her era, and intellectually formidable. Educated by her father, a controversial minister and schoolteacher in England, Hutchinson had developed deep familiarity with scripture and theological argument. She had been influenced by John Cotton, a prominent minister whose theology emphasized God's free grace over human preparation for salvation.

When Hutchinson arrived in Boston, she began doing what Puritan ideology said believers should do: she read scripture, she studied theology, she discussed sermons with others, she developed theological interpretations.

Specifically, she began holding meetings in her home where Boston women (and eventually men) gathered to discuss the previous Sunday's sermons. These were study circles—the kind of thing that was theoretically encouraged in a system that claimed to support believers' direct engagement with scripture.

But Hutchinson did something else as well. She began to develop critiques of Boston's ministers. She argued that most of them were preaching a "covenant of works"—emphasis on human preparation for salvation, on the need to demonstrate one's conversion through outward behavior and moral effort. She contrasted this with what she understood to be the true "covenant of grace"—the idea that salvation was entirely God's work, that grace was free and unearned, and that the believer's assurance came through direct internal experience of divine grace rather than through external performance of good works.

This critique was theologically sophisticated. It drew on John Cotton's teachings and on broader debates within Calvinism about predestination, justification, and the relationship between God's sovereignty and human will. These were legitimate theological questions that educated ministers debated.

But there was a problem: Hutchinson's critique implied that the ministers—the educated, trained, officially sanctioned interpreters of scripture—were wrong. She claimed that she, an educated but officially unauthorized woman, could interpret scripture more accurately than they could. She held study circles where she explained scripture to others, and in doing so, she implicitly positioned herself as an authoritative interpreter.

The Threat Hidden in Theology

Here is what is crucial: **Hutchinson's real crime was not theological. Her real crime was claiming interpretive authority.**

But the Puritan elite could not say this openly. They could not say, "We don't want you interpreting scripture because you're not part of our authorized interpreter class." That would reveal that their system was about maintaining authority, not about supporting scriptural freedom.

So they had to fight her on theological grounds. But even as they did so, they were trying to maintain the claim that her interpretation was not just wrong but heretical—beyond the pale of acceptable scriptural reading.

The problem was: how could they prove her interpretation was wrong without engaging in detailed theological debate? And if they engaged in detailed theological debate, they implicitly granted her standing as a theological interlocutor—exactly what they could not afford to do.

Governor John Winthrop's record of the controversy reveals the trap. Winthrop could articulate the charges against Hutchinson—that she claimed direct personal revelation from God, that she believed the Holy Spirit could impart knowledge beyond what scripture said, that she believed salvation came through mystical union with Christ rather than through conscious faith, that she believed the regenerate were not subject to moral law.

But when Hutchinson defended herself using scripture—when she showed that her positions were biblically grounded, when she demonstrated that other ministers held similar views—Winthrop could not simply respond that she was wrong. He had to change the grounds of the argument. He had to focus on the fact that she was claiming direct revelation, that she was a woman teaching men, that she was undermining ministerial authority.

But these are all power issues, not theological issues. And Winthrop could not openly make power arguments in a system based on ideology that rejected power-based authority.

The Gender Dimension

What is particularly revealing is that Hutchinson's gender became crucial at exactly the point where the theology was not working as a weapon against her.

Early in her trial, Winthrop tried to focus on theological issues. He questioned her about specific doctrinal points. Hutchinson, using scripture skillfully, defended her positions. She was not obviously wrong. Some of her interpretations were within the range of acceptable Puritan theology.

Then Hutchinson made a statement that shifted the entire proceeding. She declared that she held some of her beliefs not based on scripture study but based on direct revelation from God. She said that God had spoken to her directly, that she knew her salvation through immediate divine communication.

This was the moment Winthrop was waiting for. Now he could say: you are claiming direct revelation, which is enthusiasm, which is beyond scripture, which is heretical.

But even as he did so, there was a problem. John Cotton, a highly respected minister, had suggested that direct revelation was possible. Some of Cotton's own teachings implied that God's Spirit could communicate directly to believers. Male prophets in the Bible had direct revelation. Why couldn't a woman have direct revelation?

The answer, implicitly, was that she was a woman. At this point, the rhetoric shifts dramatically. Suddenly, Winthrop and other ministers focus on the fact that Hutchinson is a woman teaching men, which violates biblical prohibitions on women's public teaching. They cite 1 Timothy 2:12 about women being silent in churches.

This is revealing: when theology failed to discredit Hutchinson, the elite fell back on gender. They used a prohibition on women's teaching authority as a way to exclude her. But this is not really about gender—or rather, it is about gender as a proxy for authority. Hutchinson's crime

was claiming interpretive authority. Being a woman made it easier to exclude her for that crime without admitting that was the real issue.

The Trial as Power Struggle Masked as Theology

The trial of Anne Hutchinson (conducted in November 1637 before the General Court, followed by an ecclesiastical trial before the Boston church in March 1638) can be understood as a power struggle that had to be conducted entirely in the language of theology and doctrine.

Winthrop and the magistrates could not say: "We are removing you from power because you challenged our authority."

They had to say: "You are heretical, you are seditious, you are claiming revelations beyond scripture."

Hutchinson, for her part, could not say: "You are maintaining interpretive monopoly that contradicts your own ideology."

She had to say: "I am simply reading scripture as you taught me to read it, and what I find is different from what you teach."

The trial records show both sides struggling with these constraints. Winthrop keeps trying to establish that Hutchinson's revelations are beyond scripture. Hutchinson keeps defending her position using scripture. Winthrop keeps shifting ground, focusing on different theological issues, trying to find one that will stick. Hutchinson keeps responding biblically.

But the real issue is never directly addressed: the question of who has authority to interpret scripture and to determine orthodoxy in a system that claims to reject such authority.

Part Three: The Structural Impossibility—Why the Dilemma Has No Solution

The Trap Is Built Into the System

The Puritan Dilemma is not an accident or a temporary problem. It is built into the structure of the belief system itself.

Puritanism claims:

1. **Scripture is clear and sufficient**: All necessary truth is in the Bible. Anyone who reads it carefully can understand it.

2. **Individuals can and should interpret scripture**: Believers are not dependent on clerical mediation to understand God's word.
3. **The Holy Spirit guides believers**: God's Spirit illuminates scripture for sincere believers.
4. **Authority derives from scriptural truth, not from position**: A minister is authoritative because what he says aligns with scripture, not because of his ordination.

These claims all point toward a radically egalitarian vision of knowledge and authority. They all suggest that the barriers to scriptural understanding are educational and spiritual, not institutional. Anyone sufficiently educated and spiritual can interpret scripture.

But Puritanism also wants:

1. **Orthodoxy**: There is a correct interpretation of scripture, and incorrect interpretations are heretical.
2. **Ministerial leadership**: Ministers should guide congregations in understanding scripture and doctrine.
3. **Social order**: The community needs organized leadership, which requires some people to have more authority than others.
4. **Institutional stability**: The colony needs structure, hierarchy, and authoritative decision-making.

These two sets of claims are in direct tension. If scripture is clear and individuals can interpret it, how can you call their interpretation heretical when it differs from the official interpretation? If the Holy Spirit guides believers, how can you say one believer's experience of the Spirit is false and another's is true? If authority derives from scriptural truth, not position, how can you prevent someone who has studied scripture and prayed sincerely from claiming authority?

The only way to resolve this tension would be to openly acknowledge that you are enforcing orthodoxy through power—that you are maintaining an interpreter class not because scripture requires it but because social order requires it. But that would destroy the ideological foundation on which your authority rests.

So instead, the Puritans found themselves trapped in permanent warfare over interpretation. They could not ignore heterodox positions (that would admit interpretation was open). They could not suppress them through authority alone (that would admit authority was the issue, not theology). They had to fight every doctrinal battle theologically, trying to prove that their interpretation was what scripture actually said, while simultaneously preventing others from successfully claiming that their own interpretations were also scriptural.

The Multiplication of Heresies

One of the most revealing features of Puritan Massachusetts is how many "heresies" emerged. The Antinomians (free grace advocates). The Familists (mystical spiritualists). The Quakers

(inner light seekers). Baptist separatists. Millenarian radicals. Roger Williams and his religious toleration advocates. Samuel Gorton and his radical egalitarians.

Why so many? Because the system enabled them. Puritan ideology said people should read scripture themselves and follow the Holy Spirit's guidance. Whenever someone did that and arrived at conclusions that differed from official doctrine, they were technically operating within the system. But they were also threatening the system.

So the response was always the same: identify the person as heretical, declare their interpretation invalid, attempt to refute them theologically, and if that failed, banish them.

But banishment did not solve the problem. It just meant that someone who had been part of the community, who had learned the ideology, who had internalized the belief that individual scriptural interpretation was legitimate—that person was now outside the community spreading alternative interpretations. Roger Williams was banished and founded Rhode Island with religious toleration. Anne Hutchinson was banished and her followers started communities elsewhere. The Quakers were banished and kept returning.

The mechanism that was supposed to maintain orthodoxy (the ideology's emphasis on individual interpretation) was constantly generating heresy. The attempt to suppress heresy (through banishment and social pressure) was constantly failing because it revealed that the system was about power, not truth.

The Confession Paradox

An interesting feature of the Antinomian Controversy is that John Cotton, the minister whose theology most closely resembled Hutchinson's, was not banished. Cotton was orthodox enough, or sufficiently connected, that he could defend himself. But Hutchinson was banished.

Why? Cotton was a man and a minister. His claims to interpretive authority were backed by institutional position. Hutchinson was a woman outside the ministry. Her claims to interpretive authority directly challenged the elite's ability to control interpretation.

Cotton himself had to engage in careful theological maneuvering. He could not openly support Hutchinson (that would reveal he agreed the ministers were wrong). But he could not openly condemn her without condemning his own theology. His solution was to distance himself from her most extreme claims while still maintaining that direct divine revelation was possible and that the covenant of grace was primary.

The documents show Cotton being examined by his fellow ministers, defending his orthodoxy, carefully distinguishing his position from Hutchinson's. He was essentially claiming that his version of direct revelation theology was orthodox while Hutchinson's version was heretical—a distinction that was difficult to maintain on scriptural grounds alone.

But Cotton's institutional position allowed him to make that distinction stick. Hutchinson's lack of institutional position made her distinction unacceptable.

This reveals the truth underlying all the theological debate: the question is not really what scripture says, but who has the right to interpret what scripture says. And the answer is: those with power can interpret. Those without power cannot, regardless of how well they support their interpretation with scripture.

But this answer cannot be openly stated. It would destroy the ideological foundation of the entire system. So the Puritan elite had to go through the elaborate charade of theological debate, appearing to argue about doctrine while actually fighting about authority.

Part Four: The Perpetual Crisis Management

How Orthodoxy Became a Constantly Shifting Target

Because the Puritan system could not admit that it was enforcing interpretive authority, it had to constantly be proving its orthodoxy through theological disputation. This had a peculiar effect: orthodoxy became unstable. It could not be defined once and for all. It had to be continually reestablished and redefined.

The 1648 Cambridge Platform attempted to stabilize Congregational orthodoxy. It established procedures for church governance, defined acceptable doctrine, and created mechanisms for removing heterodox ministers. But it could not prevent the emergence of new heresies because the foundational ideology still claimed that believers could interpret scripture.

Every generation of Puritan leadership had to deal with new challenges. The second generation of ministers found themselves constantly defending against those who took the first generation's ideology too literally. If individuals should interpret scripture, why shouldn't they? If the Holy Spirit guided believers, why shouldn't they trust their own spiritual experiences?

The answer had to be theological: "Your interpretation is wrong because it contradicts scripture" or "Your spiritual experience is demonic enthusiasm, not the Holy Spirit's guidance." But these arguments could not be conclusively proven because scripture is actually ambiguous on many points and spiritual experience is inherently subjective.

So the elite had to keep arguing, keep refining their positions, keep publishing treatises against the latest heresy. Cotton Mather spent enormous energy writing against witchcraft, against Quakers, against religious enthusiasts of various kinds. These were not idle intellectual pursuits. They were necessary to maintain the claim that the official interpretation was correct and that heterodox interpretations were simply wrong.

The Trials as Ritual Reassertion of Authority

The trials for heresy, sedition, and witchcraft can be understood as rituals through which the elite repeatedly reasserted their interpretive authority. Each trial was an occasion to:

1. **Define orthodoxy more clearly**: By refuting specific heresies, the official interpretation was elaborated and distinguished from incorrect interpretations.

2. **Demonstrate the consequences of heterodoxy**: Banishment, excommunication, and (in the case of witchcraft) execution showed what happened when someone claimed authority they did not have.

3. **Affirm elite authority**: The trial process itself demonstrated that the magistrates and ministers had the right to determine truth. Even if they had to argue for their positions, the fact that they had the authority to call the trial, to question the accused, to pronounce judgment, demonstrated their power.

4. **Manage the contradiction**: The theological argument allowed the elite to fight about authority while appearing to fight about doctrine. Hutchinson was not banished for claiming authority; she was banished for heresy. That was the official record. That was what could be said and written about.

But the trials also revealed the problem. Each trial was necessary because the system kept generating heterodoxy. If orthodoxy were truly self-evident from scripture, why would there be so many heresies? Why would intelligent, educated, sincere believers keep arriving at incorrect interpretations?

The answer is that orthodoxy is not self-evident from scripture. Different interpretations are possible. But the system could not admit this because admitting it would mean admitting that the elite was enforcing orthodoxy through power, not through truth.

The Witchcraft Trials as Extreme Case

The Salem Witch Trials (1692-1693) can be understood as an extreme version of the Puritan Dilemma—what happens when the system of enforcing orthodoxy becomes completely unmoored from any constraints.

If direct revelation is possible, how do you distinguish between a true revelation from God and a false revelation from Satan? If the Holy Spirit can communicate with believers, how do you distinguish the Holy Spirit's communication from demonic deception?

The answer the Salem trials provided was: spectral evidence. The afflicted girls could see the accused's specter attacking them. They could claim visions of the accused's activities. They could provide testimony about spiritual experiences that were impossible to disprove.

This was the logical extension of the Puritan position. If you accept that believers have access to spiritual reality through visions and revelations (which the Puritan system did), and if you have no way to verify the truth of those claims except through authority (which the Puritan

system tried to avoid), you end up in a situation where anyone can claim anything about the invisible spiritual realm.

The trials were ultimately stopped when accusations reached the powerful (the governor's wife was accused). At that point, the elite recognized that the system had become too dangerous. But it took that to stop it. As long as the trials targeted the powerless—the poor, the women, the marginal—the system kept producing more "witches."

This reveals the underlying truth: the system of orthodoxy enforcement was maintained through power. When power was applied selectively (against the weak), the system worked. When power threatened to be applied universally (against the powerful), the system was shut down. This demonstrates that authority was the real issue, not theology.

Part Five: The Impossibility of Resolution

Why the Dilemma Cannot Be Solved Within the System

The Puritan Dilemma has no solution that preserves both the ideology and the authority structure. Here are the possible solutions and why none of them work:

Solution 1: Admit that authority is institutional and hierarchical

This would mean saying: "Priests and ministers have authority to interpret scripture because of their position, not because they happen to be right. Believers should defer to institutional authority."

But this would abandon the entire revolutionary appeal of Puritanism. It would admit that the elite had appropriated the anti-hierarchical ideology to break English power, then turned around and established their own hierarchy. It would reveal that the whole system was about power, not truth. The ideology would lose its legitimating force, and the authority structure would be revealed as naked coercion.

Solution 2: Truly allow open scriptural interpretation and accept theological pluralism

This would mean saying: "Different believers will interpret scripture differently. All sincere interpretations are valid. We don't need orthodoxy."

But this would destroy social order and elite authority. If everyone can interpret scripture, and all interpretations are valid, then no one has authority over anyone else. The magistrate's commands would have no more validity than anyone else's interpretation. The minister's sermon would be one opinion among many. This is incompatible with maintaining a hierarchical society where some people have authority over others.

Solution 3: Some middle position that distinguishes between "orthodox" and "heterodox" interpretation

This is what the Puritan elite attempted. But as we have seen, this solution does not work. It requires being able to prove that some scriptural interpretations are right and others are wrong. But scripture is ambiguous, and there is no objective standard for determining correct interpretation except "the interpretation of those in power."

The elite could claim that correct interpretation came from careful study of scripture and prayer for the Holy Spirit's guidance. But heterodox believers could make the same claims. They could say they too had studied scripture carefully and prayed sincerely.

So the elite had to resort to claims about the nature of the revelation—some revelations were demonic, some were divine; some interpretations came from proper reasoning, some from enthusiasm; some were conservative and true to the tradition, some were innovative and false.

But all of these distinctions could be (and were) challenged by those claiming different revelations, interpretations, and traditions.

The Permanent Fractioning

The result of the Puritan Dilemma was permanent factional division within Puritanism itself. New England produced:

- Free grace advocates (Cotton, Hutchinson)
- Preparationist orthodox (Hooker, Shepard)
- Congregationalists (Hooker, Davenport)
- Presbyterians (some Massachusetts ministers preferred Presbyterian church government)
- Separatists (those who thought the visible church should be pure, including only the regenerate)
- Baptists (those who denied infant baptism)
- Quakers (those who emphasized inner light)
- Mystical spiritualists (Familists and others)

Each group claimed to be the true heirs of Puritan ideology. Each claimed to be following scripture. Each had educated supporters. Each presented a challenge to the official orthodoxy.

The elite could suppress some of these groups (through banishment, like Roger Williams and Anne Hutchinson). They could persecute others (like the Quakers, whom they executed). But they could not eliminate the tendency toward factional division because that tendency was built into the ideology itself.

Puritanism's claim that individuals could interpret scripture empowered people to do exactly that. When those individual interpretations diverged from official doctrine, the system had no peaceful way to resolve the conflict. It had to resort to authority—trials, banishment, persecution.

But resorting to authority revealed the contradiction at the heart of the system. It revealed that power, not truth, was determining orthodoxy. And that revelation undermined the ideological foundation on which the authority rested.

Conclusion: The Structural Constraint

The Puritan Dilemma teaches us something fundamental about belief systems and power: **You cannot maintain elite interpretive authority when the belief system explicitly denies the concept of elite interpretive authority.**

The Puritans thought they could have it both ways. They could break the English episcopal hierarchy by claiming that believers could interpret scripture themselves. They could then establish their own elite interpreter class by claiming that their interpretations were correct.

But the ideology would not allow it. The same arguments that justified breaking English episcopal authority also justified challenging Puritan ministerial authority. The same ideology that empowered Puritans to interpret scripture also empowered Hutchinson, Roger Williams, the Baptists, the Quakers, and countless others to interpret scripture differently.

The elite's response was to fight constant theological battles. Each new heterodoxy had to be refuted, each rival interpreter had to be challenged, each alternative interpretation had to be declared wrong. This was exhausting, perpetual, and ultimately unsuccessful.

The system never achieved the stability the elite sought. It generated continuous factional conflict. It required constant vigilance against heresy. It produced trials, banishments, persecutions, and eventually executions (the witchcraft trials), all in an attempt to maintain orthodoxy that the ideology itself made impossible to maintain.

The Puritans had appropriated an anti-hierarchical ideology to break established power. But they had not recognized that this ideology constrained their ability to establish new power. They thought they could control the consequences of their revolutionary rhetoric. But the rhetoric had its own logic.

Every believer who took seriously the Puritan claim that they could interpret scripture was potentially a challenge to Puritan authority. Every person who followed the Puritan instruction to read scripture and pray for the Holy Spirit's guidance might arrive at conclusions that differed from official doctrine. The system had no mechanism to prevent this because preventing it would require openly acknowledging that authority, not truth, was the final arbiter—and that admission would destroy the ideological legitimacy the system depended on.

This is the Puritan Dilemma: they had weaponized a belief system to break their enemies' power, but in doing so, they had created a weapon they could not control. That weapon would

turn against them repeatedly—in the form of Antinomians, Separatists, Quakers, and countless individual believers who took the ideology seriously.

The elite's solution was perpetual crisis management: constant theological argument, endless trials for heresy, the elaboration of increasingly sophisticated distinctions between orthodox and heterodox interpretation. These mechanisms allowed them to maintain power in the short term. But they could never resolve the underlying contradiction.

And that contradiction was built into the very foundation of their system. It was not a bug that could be fixed. It was the essential logic of what happens when you appropriate an anti-hierarchical belief system in order to maintain elite authority.

References

Primary Sources - Puritan Theology and Doctrine

- Calvin, John. *Institutes of the Christian Religion* (1559)
- Cotton, John. *The Covenant of God's Free Grace* (1645)
- Cotton, John. *The Way of Congregational Churches Cleared* (1648)
- Hooker, Thomas. *A Survey of the Summe of Church Discipline* (1648)
- Perkins, William. *A Golden Chain* (1591)
- Shepard, Thomas. *The Parable of the Ten Virgins* (1660)

Primary Sources - The Antinomian Controversy

- Hall, David D., ed. *The Antinomian Controversy, 1636-1638: A Documentary History*. 2nd ed. Durham: Duke University Press, 1990.
- Winthrop, John. *A Short Story of the Rise, Reign, and Ruin of the Antinomians, Familists, and Libertines* (1644)
- Winthrop, John. *The History of New England from 1630 to 1649*, ed. James Savage (2 vols., 1825-1826)
- Winthrop, John. *Winthrop Papers* (6 vols., 1929-1992)

Primary Sources - Anne Hutchinson Trial Records

- Records of the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay in New England. Vol. 1-2. Boston: William White, 1853-1854.

Secondary Sources - The Antinomian Controversy

- Battis, Emery. *Saints and Sectaries: Anne Hutchinson and the Antinomian Controversy in the Massachusetts Bay Colony*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1962.

- Ditmore, Michael G. "A Prophetess in Her Own Country: An Exegesis of Anne Hutchinson's 'Immediate Revelation.'" *William and Mary Quarterly* 57:2 (2000).
- Stoever, William K.B. *A Faire and Easie Way to Heaven: Covenant Theology and Antinomianism in Early Massachusetts*. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1978.
- Winship, Michael P. *Godly Republicanism: Puritans, Pilgrims, and a City on a Hill*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2012.
- Winship, Michael P. *Making Heretics: Militant Protestantism and Free Grace In Massachusetts, 1636-1641*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002.
- Winship, Michael P. *The Times and Trials of Anne Hutchinson: Puritans Divided*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2005.

Secondary Sources - Anne Hutchinson

- LaPlante, Eve. *American Jezebel: The Uncommon Life of Anne Hutchinson, the Woman Who Defied the Puritans*. San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2004.
- Norwood, Frederick A. "Anne Hutchinson: A Biographical Re-evaluation." *Andover Newton Quarterly* 10 (1970).
- Porterfield, Amanda. *Female Piety in Puritan New England: The Emergence of Religious Humanism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Secondary Sources - Puritan Theology and Authority

- Como, David. *Radical Parliamentarians and the English Civil War*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.
- Lake, Peter. *The Boxmaker's Revenge: Rethinking the English Civil War*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001.
- MacCulloch, Diarmaid. *The Later Reformation in England, 1547-1603*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Seaver, Paul S. *The Puritan Lectureships: The Politics of Religious Dissent, 1560-1662*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1970.
- Tyacke, Nicholas. *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism c. 1590-1640*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987.

Secondary Sources - Massachusetts Bay Colony and Governance

- Bremer, Francis J. *John Winthrop: America's Forgotten Founding Father*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Foster, Stephen. *The Long Argument: English Puritanism and the Shaping of New England Culture, 1570-1700*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1991.
- Miller, Perry. *The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1939.
- Pope, Robert G. *The Half-Way Covenant: Church Membership in Puritan New England*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969.

- Rutman, Darrett. *Winthrop's Boston: Portrait of a Puritan Town, 1630-1649*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1965.

Secondary Sources - Gender and Authority

- Karlsen, Carol F. *The Devil in the Shape of a Woman: Witchcraft in Colonial New England*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1987.
- Norton, Mary Beth. *Founding Mothers and Fathers: Gendered Power and the Forming of American Society*. New York: Knopf, 1996.
- Reis, Elizabeth. *Damned Women: Sinners and Witches in Puritan New England*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997.
- Ulrich, Laurel Thatcher. *Good Wives: Image and Reality in the Lives of Women in Northern New England, 1650-1750*. New York: Knopf, 1982.

Theoretical Framework

- Bryan, Thomas J. *The War for Belief: How Rulers and Priests Fight for the Power to Define Reality*. 2025.
- Mann, Michael. *The Sources of Social Power, Vol. 1: A History of Power from the Beginning to A.D. 1760*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Scott, James C. *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990.
- Weber, Max. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. Translated by Talcott Parsons. New York: Scribner, 1930.

Copyright and Licensing

© 2026 Thomas J. Bryan

Licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

You are free to:

- Share — copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format
- Adapt — remix, transform, and build upon the material

Under the following terms:

- Attribution — You must give appropriate credit
- NonCommercial — You may not use the material for commercial purposes

This case study is part of the collection *Patterns of Power: Systematic Analysis of Elite Control Mechanisms Across Civilizations*